UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/810,118 | 03/25/2004 | Jayasimha Nuggehalli | 49986-0536 | 8047 |

29989        7590        12/07/2009
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| MOUTAOUAKIL, MOUNIR |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2476 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 12/07/2009 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| | 10/810,118 | NUGGEHALLI ET AL. |
| ***Office Action Summary*** | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | MOUNIR MOUTAOUAKIL | 2476 | |

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

**Period for Reply**

**Status**

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 August 2009*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.     2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-11,13 and 14* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-11,13 and 14* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail. Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### Response to Amendment

1.       The amendment filed on 08-11-2009 has been entered and considered.

Claims 1-11, and 13-14 are pending in this application.

Claim 12 is canceled.

Claims 1-11, and 13-14 remain rejected as discussed below.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.       This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3.       The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

      1.     Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
      2.     Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
      3.     Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
      4.     Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4.      Claims 1-6, and 8-11, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over by Miida et al (US 2002/0049839) in view of Lung et al (US

5,533,175), further in view of D' Amanddio et al (US 6,317,387) and further in view of

Thakor (US 2003/0220986). Hereinafter referred to as Miida, Lung, D' Amanddio and

Thakor.

        Regarding claim 1. Miida discloses an apparatus for processing network device

status data (Fig.1, 100). The apparatus comprises a storage device comprising

configuration data stored thereon, wherein the configuration data indicates both: a data

format supported by each of a plurality of recipient devices (paragraph [0139]. Element

100 receives data using PSTN format and transmits data to the intended receivers

using either e-mail or webpage depending on the user terminal), and how to convert

network device status data that conforms to a first data format into each of the data

formats supported by the plurality of recipient devices (100 converts incoming data from

PSTN format to be transmitted as e-mail (SMTP) or a webpage (http), which are

different formats); a conversion mechanism configured to process the network device

status data that conforms to the first data format (the incoming statuses are receives

through a PSTN network, 1st format) and generate based upon the configuration data

and the network device status data, report data that conforms to the data format

supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices (status data is then converted and

transmitted to the intended recipients using either e-mail or webpage depending on the

format supported by the receiver), wherein the report data includes identification data

that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data may be

routed to recipient device from the plurality of recipient devices(see Fig.2, element 22.

Paragraph 156, where each recipient is contacted or informed based on there unique

recipient ID)

Miida discloses all the limitations of the claimed invention with the exception that

the formats supported by the recipients are different from one to another, and the

storage device stores each recipient format within, and that reports are routed to an

intended recipient device. However, Lung, from the same field of endeavor, suggests

that the status report of the printer device is requested and transmitted to the host (see

col.3, lines 65-67. Report printer status to host computer, manager printer configuration

and other such housekeeping functions...). Thus, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify teaching of Miida

to include the status report of the printer device is requested and transmitted to a

specific host as disclosed by Lung in order to allow the user view the report. Moreover,

D' Amanddio, from the same field of endeavor, discloses that reports can be provided to

a first and second recipient devices using different formats (see col.18, lines 3-12, this

section suggests that reports can be delivered to end users using different formats).

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the teaching of Miida in view of Lung to include that reports can be

delivered to end users using different formats for the purpose of viewing reports, by the

end users, and satisfying as many users as possible.

Miida in view of Lung and further in view of D' Amanddio discloses all the

limitations of the claimed invention with the exception that the format is a recipient

proprietary unencrypted data format, wherein each recipient format is unique and

different than any recipient and the conversion mechanism further extract from the

network device status data, recipient identification data that uniquely identifies an

intended recipient device of the plurality of recipient devices, and select, using recipient

identification data, a recipient proprietary unencrypted data format from the set of

recipient proprietary unencrypted formats. However, Thakor, from a similar field of

endeavor discloses a method of transmitting unencrypted commands messages by

converting the neutral original command format to destination device specific format,

wherein the device specific format depends on the destination characteristics such as

device type, vendor, device manufacturer, device model, operating system (OS)

version, etc (see abstract and paragraph [0020] and paragraph [0039]). Thus, it would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

employ the conversion mechanism taught by Thakor into the communication system of

Miida for the purpose of minimizing the conversion time at each recipient device.

Regarding claim 2. Miida discloses an apparatus wherein the network device

status data is received by the apparatus directly from a plurality of multi-function

peripherals that each performs one or more of printing, copying, faxing and scanning

(see figure 1, where the status is received from a copy machine. See page 10,

paragraph 250, where the invention disclosed is applicable to printers facsimile

machine, and the like).

Regarding claim 3. Miida discloses an apparatus wherein the network device

status data specifies one or more of consumable levels, a meter reading or need for a

service call (see page 8 paragraphs 186 and 208. the status data can be related to

expandable supply such as paper, staples, ink level…).

Regarding claim 4. Miida discloses an apparatus wherein the network device

status data is received by the apparatus from a status data server that collects network

device status data from a plurality of network devices (see figure 2, element 110 is

interpreted as a status data server).

Regarding claim 5. Miida discloses an apparatus wherein the network device

status data received by the apparatus is encrypted and the apparatus is configured to

decrypt the network device status data (see page 7, paragraphs 171-173, status data is

transmitted from element 400 to 100. the data is transmitted through PSTN, which

indicate that the data is transmitted using a code or an encryption method).

Regarding claim 6. Miida discloses an apparatus wherein the conversion

mechanism is configured to generate the report data in either XML or CSV format (see

page 10, paragraph 244, and figure 2. element 20 executes the CGI program and

creates a web page data using any format. XML and CSV are different type of formats

to create data on a web pages or intranets).

Regarding claim 8. Miida discloses an apparatus wherein the apparatus is

configured to generate both first report data conforms to a first data format supported by

a first recipient device from the plurality of recipient devices and second report data

conforms to a second data format supported by a second recipient device from the

plurality of recipient devices, and provide the first report data to the first recipient device

and the second report data to the second recipient device (see figure 1 and first

embodiment of the art used. Each copier is associated with a user. Whenever a report data is generated, element 100 informs the associate recipient with the status of the copier. Therefore it provides the first report data to the first recipient device and the second report data to the second recipient device. Moreover, the system uses two different formats: email and webpage).

Regarding claim 9. Miida discloses an apparatus wherein the apparatus is configured to provide the report data to the plurality of recipient devices using one or more Internet protocols including SMTP, HTTP, HTTPS and FTP (figure 1, where the recipient is informed an e-mail or a webpage. see paragraph 311, internet protocol includes HTTP).

Regarding claim 10. Miida discloses an apparatus wherein the apparatus is configured to provide the report data to the plurality of recipient devices based upon a schedule (see paragraph 228, where element 100 is configured to provide the report data to the recipient or recipients whenever the copier is intensively used during a predetermined time frame).

Regarding claim 14. Miida discloses an apparatus that further comprises a storage device for storing the recipient device status data (see paragraph 173, where the status data received is collected and stored in the customer data base and classified customer by customer).

Regarding claim 11. Miida discloses an apparatus wherein the apparatus is configured to provide the report data at a first time to a first recipient device from the plurality of recipient devices and to provide the report data at a second time to a second

recipient device from the plurality of recipient devices, wherein the first and second times are different (see figure 1, figure 2, and paragraph156. Each ele   ment 500 is related to an office 200, element 100 provide report data to element 500n at a given time, because 500n is associated with a 200n. Element 100 provides data status to the 500n, from the associated 200n, as soon as data is received from 200n. Therefore, the processor of 100 processes status data of each 200n, one at a time).

5.      Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miida in view of Lung, further in view of D' Amanddio further in view of Thakor and further in view of Krishnaprasad et al (US 2002/0099687). Hereinafter referred to as Krishnaprasad.

        Regarding claim 7. Miida discloses all the limitations of claim 1.

        Miida does not disclose that the apparatus wherein the network device status data is XML data that conforms to a first XML schema and the report data is XML data that conforms to a second XML schema. However, Krishnaprasad discloses a method of using different XML schema (paragraph [0061]). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the XML format for the status data and report data into the report system of Miida for the purpose of having more flexibility and extensibility.

6.      Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miida in view of Lung, further in view of D' Amanddio further in view of Thakor and further in view of McGlade (US 6,411,598).

        Regarding claim 13. Miida discloses all the limitations of claim 1.

Miida does not discloses an apparatus wherein the apparatus is configured to provide a notification if a receipt confirmation indicating receipt of the report data is not received from a particular recipient device from the plurality of recipient devices. However, McGlade discloses a method of detecting transmission failure and a method of sending a notification message whenever a specific recipient is capable of receiving the original message (see column 11, lines 42-52). Thus, it would have been obvious, to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the method of detecting transmission failure and a method of sending a notification message whenever a specific recipient is capable of receiving the original message, as taught by McGlade, into the report system of Miida for the purpose of improving system reliability and customer service.

### Response to Arguments

7.      Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-11, and 13-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### Conclusion

8.      The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO_892.

9.      Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.  In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action.  In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references

applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified

citations are representative of the teachings of. The art and are applied to specific

limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is

respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the

references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well

as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully

requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure

relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds

of the claimed invention.

When responding to this office action, applicants are advised to clearly point out

the patentable novelty which they think the claims present in view of the state of the art

disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Applicants must also show

how the amendments avoid such references or objections. See 37C.F.R 1.111(c). In addition, applicants are advised to provide the examiner with the line numbers and pages numbers in the application and/or references cited to assist examiner in locating the appropriate paragraphs.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MOUNIR MOUTAOUAKIL whose telephone number is (571)270-1416. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (1pm-4:30pm) eastern time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. M./

Examiner, Art Unit 2419
/Ayaz R. Sheikh/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2476